

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 13, and 18-23 are pending in this case. Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 13 are amended, Claims 18-23 are added, and non-elected Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, and 14-17 are canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, by the present amendment. The amendments to Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 13, and the addition of Claims 18-23 are supported in the originally-filed specification at least at Figures 1, 2, and 4 and paragraphs [0043], [0054], and [0056] of the published application. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tsukada (JP 2001-77198)¹; Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Choi (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0035920); and Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Hashimoto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,975,295, herein "Hashimoto").

Non-elected Claim 1 is canceled by the present amendment. Thus, the rejection of Claim 1 is moot.

Amended Claim 2 is directed to an array substrate for a flat-panel display and includes "a pixel-electrode cutout being formed by rectangularly removing a pixel electrode throughout an area ranging from the vicinity of the area containing wire breakage to a place receiving the bypass wire, which extends along an edge of the pixel-electrode cutout."

The outstanding Office Action cites Choi as teaching all the elements of Claim 2.

Choi depicts, at Figures 2, 3D, and 4D, and describes, at paragraph [0053], a manner of repairing a short circuit between a scan line 21 and a data line 23 that includes a repair pattern 25 with cut-outs at the corners of each of the electrodes 27 and 27a.

¹ The rejection of Claim 1 is believed to be erroneous because Claim 1 was withdrawn from consideration by the Election filed on 11/19/2007. Further, while the Examiner cites Tsukada (JP 2001-77198) in the rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner also states that Tsukada (JP 2001-77198) was not considered.

However, the cut-outs of Choi do not teach or suggest “rectangularly removing a pixel electrode throughout an area ranging from the vicinity of the area containing wire breakage to a place receiving the bypass wire, which extends along an **edge** of the pixel-electrode cutout,” as recited by amended Claim 2. Instead, Choi depicts, at Fig. 2, and describes, at paragraph [0058], corners of two electrodes 27 and 27a cut out and the bypass wire overlaid **on** the surface of the remnants of the pixel electrodes 27 and 27a.

Because Choi does not teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of amended Claim 2, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from Claim 2 and, therefore, patentably define over Choi for the same reasons as Claim 2. Further, Hashimoto, which is additionally cited against Claim 3, does not cure the deficiencies of Choi with regard to Claim 2. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn.

Though differing in scope, amended Claims 7 and 8 are directed to a method for manufacturing an array substrate for a flat-panel display and include:

forming a cutout, which is a **solid region cut out from a linear fringe on one of the pixel electrodes** by removing a conductive film comprising said one of the pixel electrodes at a vicinity of the wire breakage, on one or both areas demarcated by said wire having the wire breakage, by laser irradiation; and forming a **bypass wire detouring the wire breakage** and electrically connecting two wire parts interlaying the wire breakage, by sequential or continuous depositing of a conductive layer **at an inside edge of said cutout to run along the edge of said cutout at a preset distance from said edge**, using laser CVD technique.

As discussed with regard to amended Claim 2, Choi does not teach or suggest forming a cutout or forming a bypass wire as defined by amended Claim 7 and 8. Thus, Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 13 depend from Claims 7 and 8 and, therefore, patentably define over Choi for the same reasons as Claims 7 and 8. Further, Hashimoto, which is additionally cited against Claim 9, does not cure the deficiencies of Choi with regard to Claims 7 and 8. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 9 and 13 be withdrawn.

New Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 2 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted as patentably defining over Choi for the same reasons as Claim 2.

New Claims 21-23 depend from Claims 7 or 8 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted as patentably defining over Choi for the same reasons as Claims 7 and 8.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\UMPI\25's\259427US\259427US AMND1.DOC

BRADLEY D. LYTLE
REGISTRATION NO. 40,073